[30th October 1933

(c) Yes. The Collector's report was received on the 19th June and he has been asked to hold an enquiry.

Mr. K. Singam Ayyangar :—" May I know if the Collector's report has been received, what is the result of that enquiry? "

The hon. the Raja of Bobbili :—" The Collector's report has been received and it is under the consideration of the Government."

Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed :—" May I know when the Government will pass orders on that report? "

The hon. the Raja of Bobbili :—" Very shortly; in the next few days."

Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti :—" When was it received? "

The hon. the Raja of Bobbili :—" About two or three weeks back."

Khan Bahadur P. Khalif-ul-lah Sahib Bahadur :—" May I know when the Sanitary Engineer's report referred to in clauses (a) and (b) of the answer was received? "

11-45 a.m. The hon. the Raja of Bobbili :—" I am afraid I cannot give the exact date. It was received sometime after the Collector's enquiry."

Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed :—" May I ask why so much time is taken to pass orders on the Sanitary Engineer's report? "

The hon. the Raja of Bobbili :—" The Sanitary Engineer's report does not require any immediate orders of Government."

Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti :—" Is it alleged that the Chairman has executed certain works which are unauthorized? "

The hon. the Raja of Bobbili :—" Yes, Sir; that is a fact."

Appointment of Panchayat Officers.

* 135 *Q.*—Mr. P. V. Krishnayya Choudari : Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) in how many districts panchayat officers have been appointed;

(b) in how many cases the posts were advertised for and in how many not;

(c) what the qualifications are of the officers appointed in each case;

(d) in how many cases were the appointments approved by the Government;

(e) in what boards was the approval given;

(f) what the districts are to which the Government did not give approval;

(g) what the qualifications, age and scale of pay are of the panchayat officer appointed by the Kistna District Board and approved by the Government;

(h) what the qualifications, age, etc., are of the candidate selected by the District Board, Guntur;

30th October 1933]

(*i*) what the reasons were that led the Government to refuse approval in this case;

(*j*) whether the Kistna District Board advertised for the post; and

(*k*) if so, the qualifications of the other candidates who applied for the post?

A.—(*a*) Fourteen District Boards have employed District Panchayat Officers.

(*b*) Government have no information.

(*c*) The qualifications laid down by Government for District Panchayat Officers are the general educational qualification prescribed in Article 1 of the Public Service Notification and a pass in the Account Test. Government have however no information as to the qualifications possessed by each of the District Panchayat Officers.

(*d*) & (*e*) Government issued orders in G.O. No. 1430, L. & M., dated the 11th April 1933, requiring the Presidents of District Boards to obtain their approval to the appointment of District Panchayat Officers made by them. With reference to these orders the Government accorded their approval in the case of the appointments made by the Presidents of the Madura and South Arcot District Boards. In the meanwhile, Government have taken power to appoint District Panchayat Officers themselves and pending appointments to be made by them shortly, the nominees in other cases have been allowed to continue in their posts, as a temporary measure.

(*f*) Guntur.

(*g*) The nominee proposed for appointment as District Panchayat Officer under the Kistna District Board was a matriculate who had passed the Account Test and who was reported to be aged 48 years. The pay proposed for him was Rs. 200 per mensem, the pay drawn by him as manager of the same District Board office. The appointment, however, was not made by the President, District Board.

(*h*) The candidate selected by the President, District Board, Guntur, for appointment as District Panchayat Officer was a graduate in Arts and Law and was reported to be aged 29 years.

(*i*) On the first occasion the post was not actually in existence when the appointment was made and on the second occasion Government decided to make the appointment themselves as they proposed to take powers to appoint District Panchayat Officers in the case of all districts. Moreover numerous protests were received against the appointment of the President's nominee.

(*j*) & (*k*) Government have no information.

[30th October 1933

Mr. P. V. Krishnayya Choudari:—" May I know whether the Government have ascertained whether the Kistna District Board advertised for this post or not?"

The hon. the Raja of Bobbili:—" No, Sir."

Mr. P. V. Krishnayya Choudari:—" May I know what made the Government refuse their approval to the appointment made for Guntur and sanction the appointment made by the Kistna District Board?"

The hon. the Raja of Bobbili:—" As at the time of making the appointment for Guntur the Government got power to make its selection, they did so and appointed their own men."

Mr. V. M. Ramaswami Mudaliyar:—" May I ask, Sir, whether the Government have got any proposal for the retention of the district panchayat officers already appointed?"

The hon. the Raja of Bobbili:—" All those officers who are qualified will be retained."

Mr. V. T. Arasu:—" May I know why in the case of the Guntur district alone Government have thought fit not to permit them to appoint their own panchayat officer?"

The hon. the Raja of Bobbili:—" The answer says that when the first appointment was made, there was no resolution of the district board sanctioning the post and that when the district board made the appointment the second time, the Government had already taken power to make the appointment themselves."

Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti:—" Has the President, Kistna District Board, appointed a person for the similar post in that district?"

The hon. the Raja of Bobbili:—" Yes, he has asked Government for permission to make the appointment. The appointment has not actually been made."

Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti:—" What was the order issued by the Government on that request?"

The hon. the Raja of Bobbili:—" The Government have ordered to make the appointment."

Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed:—" After the Government took power to make the appointment themselves, what prevented them from appointing the President's nominee for Guntur?"

The hon. the Raja of Bobbili:—" The Government felt that it was necessary to make the appointments in the case of all districts simultaneously."

Mr. P. V. Krishnayya Choudari:—" Are the Government advertising for the post, Sir?"

The hon. the Raja of Bobbili:—" No, Sir."

Mr. V. T. Arasu:—" May I ask if the hon. Minister is aware that even after the passing of the amending Act, the Government have

permitted several district boards to appoint their own officers and that it is only in the case of the Guntur District Board they have thought fit not to give that permission?"

The hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—"The Government have issued a circular to the effect that from a particular date no appointment should be made by any local body and since that date they have not allowed the local bodies to make these appointments."

Mr. V. T. ARASU:—"Am I to understand then that the Government have not since then permitted any district board to appoint its own panchayat officer?"

The hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—"After the passing of the order, as far as I am aware, no local body has been permitted to make its own appointment."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—"May I know what prevents the Government from withdrawing this order allowing the local bodies to make their own appointments?"

The hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—"According to the amended Act passed by this House, it was considered desirable to provincialize these services. In pursuance of that policy the Government are making these appointments themselves."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—"Will the hon. the Minister further explain his provincialization scheme and say whether he has prescribed the necessary qualifications and so on, and whether he has asked the Public Services Commission to make selections for these posts or whether he is himself going to make these appointments?"

The hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—"Qualifications have already been prescribed and the Inspector of Municipal Councils and Local Bodies has been constituted the selecting authority. Some appointments have already been made."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—"May I know from the hon. Minister whether the Government have also formulated the further policy of acting against the wishes of the municipal councils, making their own appointments and thrusting their own officers on the municipal councils?"

The hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—"That question does not arise."

Mr. V. P. NARAYANAN NAMBIYAR:—"May I know whether the first appointment to the Guntur District Board was made on the recommendation of that board?"

The hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—"Yes, Sir."

Mr. V. P. NARAYANAN NAMBIYAR:—"Is it a fact that in the resolution of the board no particular date was mentioned for the appointment of the panchayat officer?"

The hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—"I believe so."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—"May I know whether, in making these appointments, the communal ratio will be borne in mind?"

[30th October 1933

The hon. the Raja of Bobbili:—" In making his recommendations, the Inspector of Municipal Councils has been directed to remember this question."

Mr. V. T. Arasu:—" The Government are stated to have recently appointed certain panchayat officers to certain districts. May I know whether they have done so in accordance with their provincialization scheme?"

The hon. the Raja of Bobbili:—" I must ask for notice of the question."

Principles governing the distribution of grants among the Panchayat Boards for roads and water works.

* 136 *Q.*—Mr. P. V. Krishnayya Choudari: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(*a*) what the amounts placed at the disposal of the Inspector of Local Boards are for distribution among panchayats for (i) roads and (ii) water works, separately during 1932–33;

(*b*) how the amount was distributed districtwar; and

(*c*) what the principles adopted were for such distribution?

A.—(*a*) (i) Rupees 2,50,000.

(ii) Rupees 1,10,000.

(*b*) A statement[a] is laid on the table. The unit of distribution is the panchayat and not the district.

(*c*) The main principle was to make the distribution as equitable as possible and to serve as many panchayats as possible. The panchayats were taken up in order of the backwardness of the district concerned, the panchayats in the most backward districts being taken first and, as far as possible, given whatever they wanted consistently with the claims of other similarly circumstanced panchayats. Then the applications from panchayats in the less backward districts were taken up and disposed of in order. In order to be fair to all panchayats alike, applications from panchayats which received no grants or meagre grants in previous years were given preference over applications from panchayats which had received adequate grants in the past. And in order to serve the maximum number of panchayats, other things being equal, estimates for limited amounts were sanctioned in preference to estimates for large amounts. Estimates for very large works were turned down as they were not likely to be completed before the close of the year and as Government could not be committed to expenditure in future years on their account. Applications from panchayats which had made default in previous years and allowed funds to lapse in the absence of very good reasons were, as a rule, turned down.

[a] Printed as Appendix VIII on page 125 infra.